

*The*  
**WHITE PINE**  
SERIES OF  
*Architectural Monographs*  
*Volume IV* *Number 4*


A  
**WHITE PINE HOUSE**  
FOR THE  
**VACATION SEASON**


*With report of the Jury of Architects*  
*Claude Bragdon: Wm Adams Delano*  
*Hugh M G Garden: J Harleson Parker*  
*Howard Sill*

Copyright (1918)

Copyright, 1918  
GEORGE F. LINDSAY, *Chairman*  
WHITE PINE BUREAU  
SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA







FIRST PRIZE, Design No. 161  
Submitted by Richard M. Powers, Boston, Mass.

# THE WHITE PINE SERIES OF ARCHITECTURAL MONOGRAPHS

A BI-MONTHLY PUBLICATION SUGGESTING THE  
ARCHITECTURAL USES OF WHITE PINE AND ITS  
AVAILABILITY TODAY AS A STRUCTURAL WOOD

VOL. IV

AUGUST, 1918

No. 4

## REPORT OF THE JURY OF AWARD

THE THIRD ANNUAL WHITE PINE ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITION  
FOR A HOUSE FOR THE VACATION SEASON

*Judged at the Biltmore, New York, N. Y., May 18 and 19, 1918*

THE PROBLEM: "Here is a survey I have had made of my plot of land by the lake, on which I want to build a White Pine house, for use during the six open months of the year. With the information which I shall give you, you will not need to visit the property. The lake runs north and south. The shore is hilly and fairly well wooded, also somewhat rocky, and you will see that my own plot has those characteristics. My site is on the east side near the north end, and contains a blunt point from which a view is obtained looking southwest, down the lake for several miles; the prevailing breeze is from that direction. The scenery across the lake is also of interest. One approach is by boat, and you will see indicated the place where I have collected stone for a dock foundation, and you may have in mind the general appearance of a boat-house to be built later, to contain a motor-boat, and to have a landing for row-boats, with perhaps a small tea-house or lookout shelter connected with it. This is not to be built now, and I merely mention it because of its prominent position on the property. Just back of my site is a road which runs through a typical American community, and I wish my house to be appropriate to that village, and not to partake too much of the cabin or so-called bungalow design from the mere circumstance that it is on the lake.

"I do not want to spend more than \$5000 for the house. If the size and number of rooms which I consider necessary indicate a larger house than it is possible to build for that amount *under normal building conditions*, you may suggest dual use of certain of the rooms. I might say, however, that Mr. Jones told me that his house, built in the neighborhood of my site, contains 38,000 cubic feet and cost approximately what I have to spend.

"I need a good-sized living-room not smaller than 15' x 24', with a fireplace large enough for big logs, and a dining-room, connecting, if possible, with a porch where meals could be served. I would also like to have a small room for books, guns, fishing tackle, etc. If the contour of the land where you suggest placing the house will permit of a room for billiards, etc., without too much excavation, I would like it. I do not object to having two or more levels in the floors.

"My family consists of my wife, two children, a boy (fourteen) and a girl (ten), and myself. We are seldom without guests, and plan to keep 'open house,' so we would like to have five bedrooms, which may be small if well ventilated, and at least two bathrooms. Also additional accommodations for servants. We would have no objection to having sleeping quarters on the ground floor. A sleeping porch is essential. The service portion should have a kitchen, either a porch or a small sitting-room, and of course plenty of closet room.

"Although the house will be used during the open months, some arrangements for heating must be made—either sufficient open fireplaces or space provided for a small heating apparatus.

"The outside finish of the house is to be of White Pine; everything else I leave to you. By outside finish I mean siding and corner boards; window sash, frames and casings; outside doors, door frames and casings; outside blinds; all exposed porch and balcony lumber; cornice boards, brackets, ornaments and mouldings, etc., *not* including shingles. Plastering is not necessary in all the rooms and we shall attend to the wall covering ourselves.

"I have marked the place where a foundation for a garage has been started, but that will not be completed now. It may, however, have some bearing on the entrance from the road."

THE series of competitions instituted by the WHITE PINE ARCHITECTURAL MONOGRAPHS, while frankly part of a campaign to popularize the use of white pine, has nevertheless the ulterior and more altruistic objects of raising the standard of domestic architecture; of discovering and encouraging new talent, and of providing for the prospective house builder a point of departure, at least, in his enterprise. The

whole thing is part of a larger movement on the part of the manufacturers and the building trades generally,—a movement which is a hopeful sign of the times, for it is *educative* in the broadest sense of the word.

The third Annual Architectural Competition elicited two hundred and four sets of drawings. The programme called for a different type of house from those previously demanded, and the

general failure on the part of most of the competitors to perceive this is the outstanding feature of the competition. The solutions, taken as a whole, indicate an almost painful absence of direct, synthetic, logical thought. The competitors showed a disposition to evade the main issues and stress things non-essential; they over-taxed their fingers and under-exerted their brains; in general, they failed in honesty. Nevertheless, out of so many solutions, it was possible to select a sufficient number to justify the White Pine Bureau in its admirable effort.




As in all such competitions, there was a wide diversity of conceptions and style, and the committee endeavored to show such catholicity of taste as should do justice to these divergent views. It was forced to exclude some sincere and thoughtful efforts on account of a perhaps small but significant indication of a blind spot in the brain, as it was also forced to admit certain others in spite of evident obliquities of intellectual vision. The judges persisted at their task until all were in substantial agreement, their only serious differences of opinion being the result of a difference of point of view as to what particular aspect of the whole matter should be emphasized.

THE FIRST PRIZE of \$750 was awarded to Design No. 161, by Richard M. Powers, with full knowledge that the decision would, perhaps, be criticized as having been swayed by the really wonderful adroitness and æsthetic feeling manifest in the rendering. The judges feel, however, that their collective conscience is clear of this charge, because, while the rendering is undeniably beautiful, it is also undeniably true. The house itself is simple, direct and logical. It has an unmistakable wood character, it occupies its point of land as though it had a right there. Moreover, it is clear from the plan and from the scale elevations that the other views would be quite as satisfactory as the particular one chosen, a thing which can be said of very few of the designs submitted. The author has shown an indifference, almost amounting to perversity, for certain economical considerations with regard to the number and construction of the chimneys, and this almost lost him his chance of a prize. His effort to get fireplaces in every bedroom, a thing not called for, expected, or even desired, has led him into structural complications of a wholly unnecessary kind; the judges took the view that in actual execution adjustments and eliminations could be made which would leave the general conception intact. This solution exhibits a high order of ability in planning, designing and rendering. The presentation calls for

the very highest commendation. It is rare that artistic skill of such a quality is combined with such practical good sense as is shown by the floor plans. Most of the practical solutions were painfully deficient in any sense of purely æsthetic values, while the "snappy" drawings too often served only as cloaks for flagrant architectural sins.


THE SECOND PRIZE of \$400 was awarded to Design No. 132, by Otto Faelten and Donald Robb. This design composes charmingly and fits the site to admiration. It has just the right character, being neither too rustic nor too formal to comply with the conditions in this respect. The plan is excellent, although it is of a type which would lend itself more naturally to a programme less restricted in the matter of expenditure. Compressed within the limits of the cubage called for, it is too contracted, particularly in its service part. The absorption of the authors in the purely æsthetic aspect of the problem has led them to sacrifice practicality and sound construction here and there. The end gable of the main roof has no sufficient support; the floors of the open sleeping porches coming over the dining room and living room are bad, as is the flat roof on the long dormer. These are matters of which the artistic temperament is always highly impatient, but they are of the greatest moment to people who live in the house. Many of the competitors showed a disposition to sin flagrantly in similar directions. They did not attack their problem honestly and directly, but approached it from the point of view of the *camoufleur* intent upon deceptions.

THE THIRD PRIZE of \$250 was awarded to Design No. 23, by Olaf Shelgren. The author of this design did not yield to the temptation to be picturesque, and therefore avoided many of its pitfalls. The result is a design somewhat bleak and bare, but admirably honest and straightforward. This particular design proved a storm center in the deliberations of the committee, one member contending that it was the only solution which deserved any prize at all, on the ground that none of the others could be built for \$5000. An analysis of the programme, however, reveals the fact that any plan which comes within the required cubage is eligible for a prize, and that while the economic aspect of the whole matter is never to be lost sight of, it is, after all, only one of several factors. In the last analysis it is perhaps the judges' "estimate of the contestant's real ability" which scores most heavily. The Third Prize design stands high on the first two counts insisted upon in the programme: "The ingenuity shown in the development of the plans to meet




DESIGN *for*  
A WHITE PINE HOUSE FOR  
THE VACATION SEASON

SUBMITTED BY 



THE FIREPLACE SIDE OF THE LIVING RM.



FIRST PRIZE, Design No. 161, Detail Sheet  
Submitted by Richard M. Powers, Boston, Mass.

the client's needs as he has stated them," and "The fitness of the design to express the wood-built house." In meeting the third condition it is less successful, for it has no really vital relation to the given site, of which the perspective gives no suggestion. The recessed piazza with the overhang supported only on slender posts would be unhappy in execution,—almost like a mouth with a missing tooth. The sleeping porch is not expressed on the exterior with sufficient frankness. It would have been better to have made a single feature of the two superimposed porches. The roof is admirably simple and the single chimney a great economical advantage. The honesty of the whole thing, and its respect for the client's interest and wishes, are in sharp and pleasing contrast with the bulk of the solutions submitted. The plan is compact and well arranged, though the maids' rooms are too small, even for a small house.

THE FOURTH PRIZE of \$100 was awarded to Design No. 100, by Russell Barr Williamson. This is frankly of that Western school of which Mr. Frank Lloyd Wright is the most popular exponent, and Mr. Louis Sullivan the originator. This type of house, though somewhat *outré* to Eastern eyes, has distinct merits, both from the point of view of practicality and picturesqueness. It does not deserve all of the cheap jokes passed upon it by its detractors. People who live in these houses insist that they do *not* feel as though they were living in a sleeping-car. If we do not want the architectural tree to die of dry-rot, we should welcome these alien grafts, however wild and wanton their growth or however strange their bloom. This Fourth Prize house fits its site to admiration. The plan is distinctly good, the occupants would have, in Irvin Cobb's immortal phrase, "no more privacy than a gold-fish," but that is only our happy American way of living openly. Let us be glad that we have so little to conceal. The house suggests all kinds of profound readjustments—in clothes, in furniture and other human accessories—but the committee, with every disposition to change their psychology imaginatively in order to be at home in such a house, could not bring themselves to the point of desiring to sit in front of the living room fireplace.

#### MENTION DESIGNS

THE Mention designs naturally consist of such as failed, for one reason or another, to get into the winning class. They had their individual advocates on the committee, who one by one were overruled. The following commentary is based upon no order of precedence of one over another:

No. 4, submitted by E. J. Maier and T. E. King, has a charm and originality not easily to be denied. It seems to be in sympathy, however, with a different sort of landscape than the one prescribed. It is too mannered for a vacation house on such a rugged site. The plan, while possessing admirable and unusual features, has grave faults. It would have been better to have thrown the living room and the loggia together. The dormers in the wing are too small, both from an æsthetic and from a practical point of view. The sleeping porch should be accessible from the hall, or, at any rate, from the largest bedroom. The separation of the guests' bedrooms from those of the family is the finest feature of the plan. The rendering deserves especial commendation, even in a competition in which the standard in this particular is extraordinarily high. It was the often-expressed regret of the judges that some of the thought and skill which went into the presentation had not been directed toward the more important matters of arrangement and design.

No. 86, submitted by Paul R. Williams, shows a good grasp of the elements of the problem. It fits the site charmingly, is neither too free nor too formal, but the Palladian feature of the dining porch and the most unhappy dormers of the roof impair the beauty and unity of an otherwise interesting design.

No. 84, submitted by Jerauld Dahler, shows a nice feeling for the essentials of a design, but is somewhat too symmetrical and formal to conform to the spirit of the place. It is urban in feeling and would look better on a level site—as shown—than on the slope of a hill. The author has overstressed that part of the programme which suggests that the design be appropriate to a village as well as to the country. In plan the floor of the sleeping balcony, coming as it does over the living room, shows a disregard for the fundamentals of direct and sound construction in this type of a house.

No. 112, submitted by Antonio di Nardo, exceeds the cubage on a careful recomputation, and according to the terms of the programme should therefore receive no consideration whatever, but the design, plan and presentation are all so good that it forced itself upon the consideration of the judges with a power which could not be denied. In a spirit of regret, but in fairness to the other competitors, the judges cannot give it anything more than this passing word of praise.

No. 118, submitted by T. C. Pomphrey and W. R. Ralston, is interesting and important chiefly on account of its authors' departure from the other contestants in the matter of location. The house is placed far down the hill; in fact, on



the beach. This undoubtedly has its advantages, which are made the most of, but such a location would involve expensive and unnecessary fills on the shore side, or else grades too steep to be practical. The two covered porches divide the design unpleasantly and possess no outweighing advantage.

No. 124, submitted by Milton Rogers Williams, also exceeds the cubage, but the judges on that account could not deprive the other competitors of such an admirable example of beauty and restraint as this design shows. Neither No. 112 nor No. 124 exhibit any particular regard for the peculiarities of the site.

No. 165, submitted by L. E. Welsh and J. F. Yewell, makes a truly beautiful picture, but there are grave faults in it, when carefully considered with regard to construction and livableness. The sleeping porch is—to put it brutally—absurd from a practical standpoint. One would get more air and light in any of the bedrooms than in such a sleeping porch. The weight of the second story rear wall and of the main roof come directly upon the ceilings of the hall and gun room. Structural difficulties of this sort can of course be dealt with, but where they are incurred for the sake of mere picturesqueness, they cannot be justified.

No. 167, submitted by J. H. Phillips, is seductively simple and picturesque in the perspective, but the plan has been contorted and the other elevations show that the author had in mind the winning of the competition on these points at the sacrifice of other considerations. The roof lines of the rear are complicated to a degree and in certain respects the plan, the elevations and the section fail to correspond.


ALTHOUGH the duties of the jury cease at this point, there remain a few of the designs relegated to the discard, which, by reason of some special excellence, plead for a word in passing.

No. 3, submitted by Hubert G. Ripley, is wonderfully presented, but its architecture is too pre-

tentious to conform to the spirit of the programme. No. 154, submitted by Porter W. Scott, would have been better if the author had frankly abandoned every attempt at "constructed architecture" in the porches and let the simple spirit of the rest of the design have its way there as well. He has failed to reconcile convincingly these two elements in his design. The rendering of Nos. 3 and 154 are among the best submitted. No. 127, submitted by J. T. Thomson and J. P. Wilson, is in this particular the most remarkable submitted, with the exception of the First Prize design. It owes so much of its appeal to its elaborate system of stone walls, steps and gardens—is, in fact, so largely a thing of masonry rather than of wood, that it could not receive the consideration to which it was clearly entitled on other less essential counts. No. 108, submitted by Edwin J. Schmitt, Jr., is remarkable for its rendering. The style is hard and unbeautiful, but original and strong. No. 123, submitted by Arthur W. Coote, had its advocates for a high place, by reason of the qualities exhibited in the Third Prize design; but the combination of wood and stone is clearly unhappy, besides being unnecessary, and the whole design, though full of merit, is not, after all, convincing. Nos. 105, 174 and 175 are all of the same general type—a good type enough, but rather strained in their particular relations. The authors (Harry L. Skidmore, Eugene D. Monticello and Charles F. Mink, respectively) should rather have sought out a free solution instead of trying to adapt their new libretto to an already popular tune. No. 178, submitted by Carl Bradley and Herman Brookman, is well planned and designed, but the chosen scheme is too ambitious for this type of house; that is, there is too little regard for economy.


CLAUDE BRAGDON	} <i>Jury of Award</i>
WM. ADAMS DELANO	
HUGH M. G. GARDEN	
J. HARLESTON PARKER	
HOWARD SILL	






SECOND PRIZE. Design No. 132, Detail Sheet

Submitted by Otto Faelten, New York, N. Y., and Donald Robb, Boston, Mass.




SECOND PRIZE. Design No. 132

Submitted by Otto Faeltgen, New York, N. Y., and Donald Robb, Boston, Mass.




THIRD PRIZE, Design No. 23

Submitted by Olaf William Shalgren, Buffalo, N. Y.




DESIGN FOR A WHITE PINE HOUSE FOR THE VACATION SEASON

THIRD PRIZE, Design No. 23, Detail Sheet  
Submitted by Olaf William Shergren, Buffalo, N. Y.




FOURTH PRIZE, Design No. 100, Detail Sheet  
Submitted by Russell Barr Williamson, Kansas City, Mo.



# DESIGN FOR A WHITE PINE HOUSE FOR THE VACATION SEASON


FIRST FLOOR PLAN.




CUDAGI.

LIVIN' ON 14 1/2 IN.	113.99
MAINT. 14 1/2 IN.	27.74
STAIRS.	7.72
FLOOR.	144
PAINT-LIN.	24
OLD LIN.	120
CEILING.	12
TRUSS.	30.9
FLOOR COVER.	720
TOTAL WORK	3267.9

1000 201 124.




SWAMPY Pt.




FOURTH PRIZE, Design No. 100


Submitted by Russell Barr Williamson, Kansas City, Mo









MENTION, Design No. 4, Detail Sheet  
Submitted by E. J. Maier and T. E. King, Toledo, Ohio






MENTION, Design No. 86  
Submitted by Paul R. Williams, Los Angeles, Cal.




MENTION, Design No. 86, Detail Sheet  
Submitted by Paul R. Williams, Los Angeles, Cal.



MENTION, Design No. 82, Detail Sheet  
Submitted by Jerauld Dahler, Washington, D. C.




CUBAGE	
MAIN HOUSE DOMESTIC	25758
WINGS (UNDIVIDED)	25758
SEPARATE ADDITION	25758
LIVING PORCH	25758
DINING PORCH	25758
BATH	25758
TOTAL CUBIC FEET	87557





DESIGN FOR A WHITE PINE HOUSE FOR THE VACATION SEASON

MENTION, Design No. 84  
Submitted by Jerrold Dahler, Washington, D. C.




MENTION, Design No. 112, Detail Sheet  
Submitted by Antonio di Nardo, New York, N. Y.



# DESIGN FOR A WHITE PINE HOUSE FOR THE VACATION SEASON

MENTION, Design No. 112

Submitted by Antonio di Nardo, New York, N. Y.



DESIGNED BY


DESIGN FOR A WHITE PINE HOUSE FOR THE VACATION SEASON

SCALE FOR PLANS

MENTION, Design No. 118

Submitted by T. C. Pomphrey and W. Ralston, Toronto, Canada






DESIGN FOR A WHITE PINE HOUSE FOR THE VACATION SEASON

DESIGNED BY






MENTION, Design No. 118, Detail Sheet

Submitted by T. C. Pomphrey and W. Ralston, Toronto, Canada



MENTION, Design No. 124, Detail Sheet  
Submitted by Milton Rogers Williams, Highland Park, Mich.




CURRY CONTENTS	
AREA	50.00
WALLS	0.636
DOORWAY	2.00
SCREENED PORCH	1.344
PORCHES	0.240
TOTAL	56.220
APPROXIMATE COST	\$10,000


# DESIGN FOR A WHITE PINE HOUSE FOR THE VACATION SEASON

MENTION, Design No. 124

Submitted by Milton Rogers Williams Highland Park, Mich




MENTION, Design No. 165  
Submitted by J. F. Yewell and L. E. Welsh, New York, N. Y.




DESIGN <sup>of</sup> a WHITE PINE HOUSE <sup>for</sup> the VACATION SEASON

MENTION, Design No. 165, Detail Sheet


Submitted by J. F. Yewell and L. E. Welsh, New York, N. Y.



VIEW OF ENTRANCE FROM DRIVEWAY




CUBAGE	
ENTRANCE	60.00
FIRST FLOOR	172.40
2ND FLOOR	280.00
SECOND FLOOR	51.20
3RD FLOOR	6.30
4TH FLOOR	1.12
TOTAL	350.00



DESIGN FOR A WHITE PINE HOUSE FOR THE VACATION SEASON • SUBMITTED BY


MENTION, Design No. 167  
Submitted by J. H. Phillips, New York, N. Y.



DESIGN FOR A WHITE PINE HOUSE FOR THE VACATION SEASON - SUBMITTED BY

MENTION, Design No. 167, Detail Sheet  
Submitted by J. H. Phillips, New York, N. Y.

DESIGN FOR A WHITE PINE HOUSE  
FOR THE VACATION SEASON



DESIGN No. 3


Submitted by Hubert G. Ripley, Boston, Mass.



DESIGN No. 178


Submitted by Karl Bradley and Herman Brookman, New York, N. Y.






DESIGN No. 154

Submitted by Porter W. Scott, Brooklyn, N. Y.



DESIGN No. 127

Submitted by J. T. Thomson and J. P. Wilson, New York, N. Y.



DESIGN No. 108

Submitted by Edwin J. Schmitt, Jr., New York, N. Y.

*Subjects of Previous Numbers of*

## THE WHITE PINE SERIES OF ARCHITECTURAL MONOGRAPHS

Vol. I, No. 1.	Colonial Cottages - - - - -	Joseph Everett Chandler
Vol. I, No. 2.	New England Colonial Houses - - - - -	Frank Chouteau Brown
Vol. I, No. 3.	Farm Houses of New Netherlands - - - - -	Aymar Embury II
Vol. II, No. 1.	Houses of the Middle and Southern Colonies - - - - -	Frank E. Wallis
Vol. II, No. 2.	Domestic Architecture in Massachusetts - - - - -	Julian Buckly
Vol. II, No. 3.	Early Houses of the Connecticut River Valley - - - - -	Richard B. Derby
Vol. II, No. 4.	A Suburban House and Garage - - - - -	Report of Jury of Award
Vol. II, No. 5.	Old Woodbury and Adjacent Domestic Architecture in Connecticut - - - - -	Wesley S. Bessell
Vol. II, No. 6.	Colonial Architecture of the Eastern Shore of Maryland - - - - -	Charles A. Ziegler
Vol. III, No. 1.	Three-Story Houses of New England - - - - -	Frank Chouteau Brown
Vol. III, No. 2.	Early Wooden Architecture of Andover, Massachusetts - - - - -	Addison B. Le Boutillier
Vol. III, No. 3.	Old Houses of Newburyport, Massachusetts - - - - -	Richard Arnold Fisher
Vol. III, No. 4.	A White Pine House to Cost \$12,500.00 - - - - -	Report of Jury of Award
Vol. III, No. 5.	The Bristol Renaissance - - - - -	Joy Wheeler Dow
Vol. III, No. 6.	The Early Dwellings of Nantucket - - - - -	J. A. Schweinfurth
Vol. IV, No. 1.	Marblehead - - - - -	William Truman Aldrich
Vol. IV, No. 2.	Some Old Houses on the Southern Coast of Maine - - - - -	C. Howard Walker
Vol. IV, No. 3.	Providence and Its Colonial Houses - - - - -	Norman M. Isham

*List of Members of*

**THE NORTHERN PINE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION OF  
MINNESOTA, WISCONSIN AND MICHIGAN**

W. T. BAILEY LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Virginia, Minn.
CLOQUET LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Cloquet, Minn.
CROOKSTON LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Bemidji, Minn.
DULUTH LOG COMPANY . . . . .	Duluth, Minn.
INTERNATIONAL LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	International Falls, Minn.
JOHNSON-WENTWORTH COMPANY . . . . .	Cloquet, Minn.
THE J. NEILS LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Cass Lake, Minn.
NICHOLS-CHISHOLM LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Frazee, Minn.
NORTHLAND PINE COMPANY . . . . .	Minneapolis, Minn.
THE NORTHERN LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Cloquet, Minn.
PINE TREE MANUFACTURING COMPANY . . . . .	Little Falls, Minn.
RUST-OWEN LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Drummond, Wis.
ST. CROIX LUMBER & MFG. COMPANY . . . . .	Winton, Minn.
SHEVLIN-CLARKE COMPANY, LTD. . . . .	Fort Frances, Ont.
J. S. STEARNS LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Odanah, Wis.
THE I. STEPHENSON COMPANY . . . . .	Wells, Mich.
THE VIRGINIA & RAINY LAKE COMPANY . . . . .	Virginia, Minn.

---

*List of Members of*

**THE ASSOCIATED WHITE PINE MANUFACTURERS OF IDAHO**

BLACKWELL LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Coeur d' Alene, Idaho
BONNERS FERRY LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Bonnors Ferry, Idaho
DOVER LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Dover, Idaho
HUMBIRD LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Sandpoint, Idaho
MCGOLDRICK LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Spokane, Wash.
MILWAUKEE LAND COMPANY . . . . .	St. Joe, Idaho
PANHANDLE LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Spirit Lake, Idaho
POTLATCH LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Potlatch, Idaho
ROSELAKE LUMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Roselake, Idaho
EDWARD RUTLEDGE TIMBER COMPANY . . . . .	Coeur d' Alene, Idaho.

---

*Any information desired regarding White Pine will be furnished  
by any member of either Association or by the*

**WHITE PINE BUREAU**

*Merchants Bank Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota*

Representing

The Northern Pine Manufacturers' Association of Minnesota, Wisconsin  
and Michigan and The Associated White Pine Manufacturers of Idaho

